



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE: July 30, 2007

TO: Examiner Minh Dinh

VIA: DIRECTOR, Technology Center AU 2132

APPLICATION NO. 09/749,142

Please consider attached AMENDMENT to determine if the proposed response would place this application in condition for allowance in the event it is revived. If the response would place the application in condition for allowance, **write in the margin of the response “OK to enter upon revival”.**

If the response would not place the application in condition for allowance, complete Form PTOL-303 (Advisory Action), but do not mail the form to the applicant. See MEPE 711.03(c).

PLEASE RETURN THE ATTACHED AMENDMENT TO MAIL STOP PETITIONS, MDW 7A58 WITHIN ONE WEEK OF THE ABOVE DATE.

Karen Cleary
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/749,142	WILLE ET AL.	
Examiner Minh Dinh	Examiner	Art Unit	
	2132		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 2-4 and 6-14.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment cancelling claims 15-28 will be entered because it reduces the number of issues to be resolved; however, Applicant's arguments regarding the remaining claims are not persuasive. Applicant argues that executing the dummy operation of Jahnich simultaneously with a useful operation would be directly contrary to Jahnich's specific teaching that useful and dummy operations should be randomly distributed overtime (page 6, first full paragraph). Jahnich teaches that executing of dummy operations causes additional advantageous current fluctuations to be observed in a DPA analysis and thus contributes to the confusion of an attacker (col. 6, lines 28-37). Jhanich further teaches that it would provide additional benefits if the dummy operations are randomly distributed over time, i.e., they are not executed in a fixed order in relation to the useful operations (col. 6, lines 39-48). Because the dummy operations are not executed in a fix order, it does not mean that they cannot be executed simultaneously with useful operations. A well known problem in parallel processing art is that two operations may not be simultaneously executed if execution of one operation depends on the result of execution of the other, i.e., one has to wait for the other to finish. However, Jhanich's dummy operations do not influence the useful operations, and, therefore, are prime candidates for parallel processing. The combination of Patarin and Jahnich would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.